

JENNIFER SALZMAN ROMANO (SBN 195953)  
jromano@crowell.com  
ANDREW HOLMER (SBN 268864)  
aholmer@crowell.com  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
515 South Flower Street, 40th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213.622.4750  
Facsimile: 213.622.2690

APRIL N. ROSS (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
aross@crowell.com  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2595  
Telephone: 202.624.2500  
Facsimile: 202.628.5116

Attorneys for Defendant  
UNITED BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

*(Additional Counsel on Signature Page)*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DAVID AND NATASHA WIT, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED BEHAVIORAL HEALTH,  
Defendant.

Case No. 3:14-CV-02346-JCS  
Related Case No. 3:14-CV-05337-JCS

**JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER REGARDING UBH'S MOTION  
TO STAY (ECF NO. 631)**

GARY ALEXANDER, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED BEHAVIORAL HEALTH,  
Defendant.

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-1(b), 6-2 and 7-12, the Parties in the above-captioned  
 2 action, by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

3 WHEREAS, on December 18, 2023, this Court issued its Order re Scope of Remand in  
 4 which the Court ruled on certain issues pertaining to the scope of proceedings remanded by the  
 5 Ninth Circuit and directed the Parties to meet and confer regarding a “schedule for the remainder  
 6 of the case” (ECF No. 625, at 49);

7 WHEREAS, in directing the Parties to meet and confer about a case schedule, the Court  
 8 “envision[ed] that the first stage of the proceedings on remand will be focused on class  
 9 certification, to be followed by motion practice relating to the issues of exhaustion and other  
 10 clarifications consistent with the mandate and then motion practice relating to remedies” (*id.*);

11 WHEREAS, on January 9, 2024, the Parties filed a Joint Notice Regarding Case  
 12 Management Schedule (“Joint Notice”) in which the Parties set out their respective positions on a  
 13 schedule for further proceedings in this Court (ECF No. 629);

14 WHEREAS, in the Joint Notice, Plaintiffs proposed a case schedule that, among other  
 15 things, began with briefing on Plaintiffs’ proposed Motion to Recertify Denial of Benefits Claims  
 16 and Certify Reprocessing Subclasses (*id.* at 4);

17 WHEREAS, in the Joint Notice, among other things, UBH stated its position that UBH  
 18 opposed Plaintiffs’ proposed schedule; UBH informed the Court that UBH intended to file a  
 19 petition for writ of mandamus from the Court’s Order re Scope of Remand; and UBH requested  
 20 that this Court stay further proceedings pending the resolution of UBH’s then-forthcoming  
 21 petition for writ of mandamus (*id.*, at 5-7);

22 WHEREAS, on January 11, 2024, the Court entered an Order Setting Briefing Schedule  
 23 on UBH’s Request to Stay (ECF No. 630);

24 WHEREAS, the Court directed UBH to file a motion to stay no later than January 16,  
 25 2024, directed Plaintiffs to file their opposition no later than January 23, 2024, and directed UBH  
 26 to file its reply on January 26, 2024 (*id.*);

27 WHEREAS, on January 12, 2024, UBH filed a petition for writ of mandamus from the  
 28 Court’s Order re Scope of Remand in the proceeding *United Behavioral Health v. United States*

1 *District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco*, Ninth Cir. No. 24-00242  
 2 (the “Petition”);

3 WHEREAS, in UBH’s Petition, UBH has requested that the Ninth Circuit issue a writ of  
 4 mandamus directing this Court to: (1) enter judgment for UBH on Plaintiffs’ denial of benefits  
 5 claim; (2) promptly notify former class members that the denial of benefits classes have been  
 6 decertified; (3) conduct no further proceedings on Plaintiffs’ denial of benefits claims, including  
 7 but not limited to further class certification proceedings on that claim or Plaintiffs’ request for  
 8 claim reprocessing; and (4) limit further proceedings in this Court solely to Plaintiffs’ fiduciary  
 9 duty claim with respect to the narrow issues on that claim that UBH contends the Ninth Circuit  
 10 identified in the mandate on UBH’s prior Ninth Circuit appeal (*see* Ninth Cir. No. 24-00242, ECF  
 11 No. 1);

12 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs oppose the Petition;

13 WHEREAS, the Ninth Circuit has not yet acted on UBH’s Petition;

14 WHEREAS, UBH filed its motion to stay on January 16, 2024 (ECF No. 631);

15 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their opposition to UBH’s motion to stay on January 23, 2024  
 16 (ECF No. 632);

17 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs stated in their opposition that, while Plaintiffs oppose the stay  
 18 requested by UBH, Plaintiffs “would not object to entry of a schedule that prioritizes proceedings  
 19 on the breach of fiduciary duty claims, which are separate and distinct from the denial of benefits  
 20 claims.” ECF No. 632, at 9.

21 WHEREAS, in light of Plaintiffs’ statement in their opposition brief, the Parties have  
 22 begun to meet and confer to explore whether the Parties can stipulate to the entry of a case  
 23 schedule that prioritizes proceedings on the breach of fiduciary duty claims, and which stays or  
 24 defers further proceedings and briefing on issues relating to class certification, Plaintiffs’ denial  
 25 of benefits claim, and Plaintiffs’ request for claim reprocessing, which are the subject of UBH’s  
 26 Petition;

27 WHEREAS, the Parties require additional time to meet and confer to determine whether a  
 28 stipulation can be reached that will avoid the need for the Court to rule on UBH’s pending motion

1 to stay, and request additional time to do so;

2 WHEREAS, to allow the parties sufficient time to meet and confer, the parties agree that  
3 UBH's deadline to file its reply in support of its motion to stay should be continued and the Court  
4 should defer ruling on UBH's pending motion to stay as set forth below;

5 **IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED** that, subject to the approval of the  
6 Court:

- 7 1. The Parties shall have until January 31, 2024 to submit a stipulation and proposed  
8 order regarding the entry of a case schedule;
- 9 2. In the event that the parties are unable to reach a stipulation, UBH shall file its  
10 reply brief in support of its motion to stay no later than February 1, 2024;
- 11 3. The Court will defer decision on UBH's motion to stay (ECF No. 631) pending  
12 either the submission of a stipulation on January 31, 2024 or the filing of UBH's  
13 reply brief on February 1, 2024.

14  
15 Respectfully Submitted:

16 Dated: January 26, 2024

ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER LLP

17 /s/ Caroline E. Reynolds

18 Caroline E. Reynolds  
19 D. Brian Hufford  
Jason S. Cowart

20 PSYCH-APPEAL, INC.  
21 Meiram Bendat

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

23 Dated: January 26, 2024

CROWELL & MORING LLP

24 /s/ Jennifer S. Romano

25 Jennifer S. Romano  
26 April N. Ross  
Andrew Holmer

27 *Attorneys for Defendant United Behavioral Health*  
28

**ATTESTATION**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3) regarding signatures, I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatories.

Dated: January 26, 2024

/s/ Jennifer S. Romano  
Jennifer S. Romano

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Joseph C. Spero  
United States Magistrate Judge